



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/471,030	12/23/1999	MASANORI WAKAI	35.C14127	6923
5514	7590	03/29/2004	EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			EDOUARD, PATRICK NESTOR	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2654	
			DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/471,030

Applicant(s)

WAKAI ET AL.

Examiner

Patrick N. Edouard

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 23-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 23-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to communication filed 1/8/04 (paper #10).

Claims 1-19 and 23-41 are pending. Claims 20-22 and 42-44 are canceled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 and 23-41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 12-19, 23, 34-41 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Namba et al (5,884,249).

As per claims 1 and 23, Namba et al teach an information processing apparatus comprising (figures 1, 2, 9, 13 and 15):

A plurality of input means for inputting different types of information (his voice recognition section 1, his touch panel section 2, his keyboard section 3, col. 6, lines 50 to col. 7, line 15);

Storage means for storing information input from each of said plurality of input means with an input time thereof (his recognition selecting section 4, col. 2, lines 10-19, lines 24-32, his input time stamp recognition); and

“input analyzing means for analyzing a sequence of the at least two types of information sorted by said input means” (col. 7, lines 15-24, his recognition result selecting section 4 and his semantic analyzing section 5, col. 8, lines 38-46, lines 61-67, col. 10, line 35-50).

As per claim 12, Namba et al teach wherein said input means can input key information (figure 1, his inputting means group 121).

As per claims 13, 16 and 17, Namba et al teach wherein said input means can input character information by converting the key information.(figure 1, his touch panel 2 and his keyboard 3)

As per claim 14, Namba et al teach wherein said input means can input speech information (His voice recognition 1)).

As per claim 15, Namba et al teach wherein said input means can input character information by recognizing the speech information and converting the speech information into character information (his inputting means group 121).

As per claims 18-19, Namba et al teach wherein said input means can input handwritten information (figure 15, a graphic recognition section 143 which recognizes hand-written or printed characters of figures at col. 27, lines 38-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-11 and 24-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namba et al (5,884,249) in view of Jackson et al (6,292,767 B1).

As per claim 2, It is noted that Namba et al teach the claimed invention but do not explicitly teach wherein said input analyzing means includes: " input information concept instance generating means for generating a concept instance from each piece of the input information "; and "concept instance unifying means for unifying a plurality of generated concept instances. However, these features are well known in the art as evidenced by Jackson et al who teach:

"input information concept instance generating means for generating a concept instance from each piece of the input information " (figure 3, his interpretations 270, col. 3, lines 4-22); and

"concept instance unifying means for unifying a plurality of generated concept instances" (col. 3, lines 22-58, his user specification of application semantic comprising several computer resident files). Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have it obvious to incorporate into the input information analyzing unit of Namba et al the user specification as taught by Jackson et al because it would provide a development system that allow a developer to easily create natural language understanding systems.

As per claim 3, Jackson et al teach wherein the concept instance includes a type of a slot and an instance corresponding to the slot of the type (col. 3, lines 4-22, his command type slot 340 with a value "transfer")

As per claim 4, Jackson et al further comprising:

"a database for storing the input information and information necessary for generating the concept instance, in one-to-one correspondence"; (figure 4b, his user specification of applications semantics , col. 3, lines 37 to col. 4, line 20); and

"retrieving means for retrieving information necessary for generating the concept instance corresponding to the input information, from said database, (col. 3, lines 45-57);

wherein said input information concept instance generating means generates the concept instance in accordance with the information retrieved from said database (col. 3, line 22 to col. 4, line 20).

As per claim 5, Jackson et al teach wherein said database stores a concept type, a rule necessary for the concept instance, and a rule necessary for a surface layer word, respectively corresponding to a surface layer character string. (col. 3, lines 22 to col. 4, lines 20, his slot definition file 420, his grammar file 430 and his slot classes 440)

As per claim 6, Jackson et al teach wherein said unifying means unifies the concept instances in accordance with the rules (figures 4a and 4b, col. 3, line 22-57).

As per claim 7, Jackson et al teach wherein said database stores, as a definition of a concept, a slot type of a slot which the concept instance can have, and a rule which

is required to be satisfied by the instance corresponding to the slot (figures 4a-4b, col. 3, lines 22-27, his slot definition file and his grammar file).

As per claims 8, Jackson et al teach wherein said unifying means unifies the concept instances in accordance with the rule designated by the definition of the concept corresponding to the type of the concept of the concept instance (col. 3, lines 22 to col. 4, lines 20)

7. Claims 23-41 and 45 are the same in scope and content as claims 1-19 above and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

9. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry) Or:

(703) 305-9508 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick N. Edouard whose telephone number is (703) 308-6725. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 07:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (703) 305-9645.

The facsimile phone number for this Art Unit is (703) 305-9508. Alternatively, facsimile messages may be sent directly to (703) 305-9644 where they will be stored in the examiner's voice mailbox (telling the examiner that a fax was received) and be automatically printed (i.e. - no delay by the examiner).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Patrick N. Edouard

March 19, 2003



PATRICK N. EDOUARD
PRIMARY EXAMINER